38. Game Laws

Mr. A. J. Wright (Member, Kannan Devan Planters' Association) said that he wished to place before Government the request of his Association to have their Game Committee recognised under Regulation XII of 1089 and to empower the Committee to act in cases of criminal breaches of the law. The powers sought for by the Committee were under sections 6, 7, 9, 10, 17 and 18 of the Regulation. The Committee consisted of the keenest sportsmen of the district including the District Magistrate and would be glad to render any assistance to Government for the preservation of game in the High Range.

To the Dewan's query whether the Regulation contemplated the recognition of such Committees, the Member said that the Regulation was a mere framework, that all the details were left to be supplied in the form of rules and that rules had not been framed under the Regulation. The Member added that the Regulation provided for the appointment of certain persons to form a Game Committee and that he thought that the persons need not be Government officers necessarily.

Dewan's reply.—The Government have received certain draft rules from the Conservator of Forests and the Commissioner of Devicolam and they are under consideration. The whole question will be carefully looked into without delay.

(2) Criminal Justice.

39. Need for converting the Additional Munsiff's Court at Tiruvalla into a Munsiff—Magistrate's Court and for locating the same at Kallooppara.

Mr. K. Govinda Pillai (Member, Tiruvalla taluk) said that the distance from the Tiruvalla court-house to the eastern extremity of its jurisdiction was 25 miles and that there were not sufficient facilities of communication for the people of the eastern *pakuthis* to reach Tiruvalla town. The people of the eastern *pakuthis*, therefore, found it difficult to go to the town to transact their business. He suggested that one of the two Munsiffs' Courts at Tiruvalla be transferred to the eastern *pakuthis* and the Munsiff invested with Magisterial powers also. The jurisdiction of the new Court should extend to the *pakuthis* of Kallooppara, Ezhumattur, Aiyrur, Thottappuzhacherry and Koipuram in the Tiruvalla taluk and the Nedumkunnom *pakuthi* of the Changanacherry taluk, which was already under the jurisdiction of the Tiruvalla Court. Both the population and the revenue of the above *pakuthis* would justify the opening of a Court for their use. The average number of Civil and Criminal cases in the above area would come to 700 and 300 respectively per year.

Dewan.—The Government have consulted the High Court about this proposal and the latter are against the arrangement suggested.

Member.—Their objection is probably based on the ground that there are already too many Courts, but the High Court ignore our actual requirements. Their view is based on the general policy not to increase the number of Courts.

Dewan.—If a Magistrate-Munsiff's Court is opened at Kallooppara, the Munsiff and the Magistrate at Tiruvalla will not have sufficient work. Moreover, the High Court are against the combination of functions of a Munsiff and those of a Magistrate in one and the same person. The Government are also of the same view.

The Member, continuing, said that there *was* sufficient work for two Courts at present, that the Government would not be put to the necessity of incurring any additional expenditure and that the people were prepared to hand over the required site and building to Government.

In view of the circumstances explained above, the Member prayed that the Additional Munsiff's Court at Tiruvalla be transferred to Kallooppara and the Munsiff invested with Magisterial powers, or, if that was not possible, that at least one of the Magistrate's Courts be shifted to Kallooppara for the use of the eastern *pakuthis* of the Tiruvalla taluk.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly